

Marianne L. Padgett

1762

[illegible]

INTERFERENCE SEARCHED			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

SEARCH NOTES (INCLUDING SEARCH STRATEGY)		
	DATE	EXMR
enquired concerning claim classification, see attached e-mails	12/17/2004	<i>[Signature]</i>
	1/12/2005	<i>[Signature]</i>
	1/25/2005	<i>[Signature]</i>
	1/26/2005	<i>[Signature]</i>
spoke to Lynette Smith & Long Le about classification, the latter confirmed 435/5 for some products & kits; apparatus was	2/3/2005	<i>[Signature]</i>
suggested for other kits & use of combination subcombinationin restricting		<i>[Signature]</i>
consulted with Shrive Beck on classification	2/3/2005	<i>[Signature]</i>



# attach to search notes

**Padgett, Marianne**

---

**From:** Chan, Christina  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 1:44 PM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Cc:** Ward, Edward  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Not 1644 subject matter. Ed Ward might be able to figure it out.

*Chris Chan*

TC 1600 New Hire Training Coordinator and SPE 1644  
(571)-272-0841  
Remsen, 3E89

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762,

ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:



process claims 1-17, 19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18, 41, 64, 98-134, 136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but it's way outside my area, so could you or one of your examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).



## Padgett, Marianne

---

**From:** Ward, Edward  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 13, 2005 5:28 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

If you restrict out the coating process, it may go to AU 1648, 435/5, since it is making an antibody/antigen test system for detecting a virus, among other things.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 2:34 PM  
**To:** Ward, Edward  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

Mr. Ward, You were suggested as the possible solution to my where do these claims go problem by Mr. Page. Can you help please? Mimi Padgett (AU 1762)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Page, Thurman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+.  
Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page  
SPE, Art Unit 1615  
Technology Center 1600  
571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995



I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:  
process claims 1-17, 19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18, 41, 64, 98-134, 136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but it's way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).



## Padgett, Marianne

---

**From:** Shukla, Ram  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 3:31 PM  
**To:** Warden, Robert; Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

This is not 1632 matter.

Ram Shukla

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Robert  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 1:41 PM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I'll join Thurman in getting out of the way. We have the apparatus part of 435 and I don't see any claims that would fall into our area. The way 435 is set up the kit claims should go with the method not into the apparatus area. Good Luck.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995



Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:  
process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135,140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).



## Padgett, Marianne

---

**From:** Seidleck, James  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:45 PM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

That sub requires a microcapsule to be formed. I don't think this coated bilayer is a microcapsule. I think this is TC1600 subject matter, even though they don't seem to think so.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2005 12:56 PM  
**To:** Seidleck, James  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

It was suggested to me that the process of patterning a lipid bilayer (clms 1-17, 19-40 & 42-63) might go in 264/4.1+. Are they related? I've never done a case on lipid bilayers, so I don't know if this is reasonable or not.

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Page, Thurman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+.

Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page  
SPE, Art Unit 1615  
Technology Center 1600  
571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael



**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:  
process claims 1-17, 19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18, 41, 64, 98-134, 136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140 ???/???)

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but it's way outside my area, so could you or one of your examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).



**Padgett, Marianne**

---

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 26, 2005 9:22 AM  
**To:** Housel, James; Smith, Lynette  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

*No response  
received*

AU 1648 &/or 435/5 have been suggested to me for some of the claims of this case. Do you agree with this for any of the claims? If so which ones & what would you suggest is the appropriate classification for the others? Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762; REM 8D71; 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ward, Edward  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 13, 2005 5:28 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

If you restrict out the coating process, it may go to AU 1648, 435/5, since it is making an antibody/antigen test system for detecting a virus, among other things.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 2:34 PM  
**To:** Ward, Edward  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

Mr. Ward, You were suggested as the possible solution to my where do these claims go problem by Mr. Page. Can you help please? Mimi Padgett (AU 1762)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Page, Thurman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+.  
Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page  
SPE, Art Unit 1615  
Technology Center 1600  
571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?



1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:  
process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135,140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but it's way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).



## Padgett, Marianne

---

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 26, 2005 9:47 AM  
**To:** Nakarani, Dhirajlal  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995

*no response received*

It was suggested to me by Mr. Page that the product having a lipid bilayer (claims 18, 41, 64, 98-134, 136-139) might go in 428/402 or 403+, but given Mr. Seidleck's comments, I have my doubts. Do you know of any appropriate 428 subclasses or can you suggest any appropriate class or art unit?

Thank you, Mimi

Padgett (AU 1762, REM 8D71, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Seidleck, James  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:45 PM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

That sub requires a microcapsule to be formed. I don't think this coated bilayer is a microcapsule. I think this is TC1600 subject matter, even though they don't seem to think so.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2005 12:56 PM  
**To:** Seidleck, James  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

It was suggested to me that the process of patterning a lipid bilayer (clms 1-17, 19-40 & 42-63) might go in 264/4.1+. Are they related? I've never done a case on lipid bilayers, so I don't know if this is reasonable or not.

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Page, Thurman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995  
**Importance:** High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+.

Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page  
SPE, Art Unit 1615  
Technology Center 1600  
571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM  
**To:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: classification? - 10/698,995



Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Warden, Jill  
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM  
**To:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Cc:** Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "selective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Padgett, Marianne  
**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Warden, Jill  
**Subject:** classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:  
process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;  
product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &  
Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but it's way outside my area, so could you or one of your examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).